

CALFED BAY-DELTA WATERSHED PROGRAM

BDAC Watershed Work Group Meeting Summary

Meeting Date: Friday, July 21, 2000

Meeting Location: Jones & Stokes
2600 V Street
Sacramento, CA

Meeting Attendees: See Attachment A

Introductions

Watershed Work Group (Work Group) Co-Chairs Robert Meacher and Martha Davis began the meeting with introductions. A list of attendees (Attachment A) and meeting handouts (Attachment B) are included with this summary.

Agenda Review

Ms. Davis reviewed the agenda with the Work Group. The morning agenda items included a review of the Work Group's accomplishments to date and a discussion of the future role of BDAC. Ms. Davis explained that these agenda items were prompted by a letter she and Mr. Meacher received from Mike Madigan, chair of BDAC. The letter requested that the Work Group provide information on additional tasks that need to be conducted. The Work Group was also asked to highlight any specific issues that should be brought to the attention of BDAC members. Ms. Davis explained that she thought this would be a good time to review Work Group accomplishments, discuss short-term tasks, and consider the group's future role. The letter will, in part, create a record of the Work Group's accomplishments and outline the future tasks. Ms. Davis will use the feedback from the meeting's discussion to draft the reply letter with Mr. Meacher and John Lowrie (Watershed Program manager).

Watershed Work Group Discussion

Where the Work Group Has Been

Mr. Meacher began the discussion by providing a historical perspective on the Work Group. He explained that a BDAC meeting addressing watershed issues was held in Redding in April 1998. The meeting was well attended and generated considerable support for the formation of a watershed work group. The first Work Group meeting was held in August 1998 and has since drawn a remarkable level of participation.

What the Work Group Has Accomplished

Ms. Davis began a discussion regarding the accomplishments of the Work Group by pointing out three notable achievements. First, she explained that the Watershed Work Group helped to

shape and develop the Watershed Program within 1 year. This is quite an accomplishment because most of the other Common Programs had 2 to 3 years to develop their programs. Second, the Work Group helped CALFED to consider the benefits that a broad geographic scope can bring to the solution area. The Work Group also encouraged CALFED to view the Bay-Delta as a whole watershed and take a watershed approach to addressing problems. Third, the Work Group has brought together a broad array of stakeholders. These stakeholders have worked together to weave a vision of a watershed approach for CALFED that is inclusive and tries to integrate not only the different constituencies, but the different issues that CALFED is addressing through a watershed approach. Ms. Davis noted that she was particularly pleased that environmental justice and tribal issues have been discussed.

Other achievements noted by the Work Group included the following:

- # The Work Group is a model that proves that inclusive and consensus-based groups can get things done in a timely manner.
- # The Work Group meetings provide a forum to gather and share information and be informed of watershed issues throughout the state.
- # The Work Group has a problem solving focus.
- # As the Work Group has interacted with the Watershed Program's Interagency Watershed Advisory Team (IWAT), the watershed groups and agency representatives have built partnerships.
- # The Work Group has helped to change the nature of the Watershed Program from an "element" of CALFED to an approach to be used by CALFED as a whole.
- # The Work Group has helped to bring recognition that many small scale projects can be just as beneficial as a few large projects.
- # The Work Group has emphasized the importance of local people and communities working in the watershed.
- # The Work Group has been the only consistent forum to learn and teach others about their own watersheds and to exchange information.
- # Meetings of the Work Group enable individuals to share success stories and lessons learned from other watershed groups.
- # The Work Group has helped to discard the north/south watershed view and create a more holistic watershed view.
- # The Work Group meetings provide a forum to address environmental justice and tribal issues.

Areas of Improvement for the Work Group

Ms. Davis asked the group members if they had any comments on areas in which the Work Group needed to improve. One meeting participant stated that the Work Group meetings need to include more watershed coordinators and others who are working “on the ground.” Outreach is needed to convince these individuals that their participation is important. Other participants noted that more involvement is needed from water agencies who have water rights, and Southern California watershed representatives. It was also suggested that the Work Group needs to better integrate with the other Common Programs.

Status of the Work Group

The discussion then turned to the present state of both the Watershed Program and CALFED as a whole. Mr. Lowrie announced that the final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) was posted on the CALFED website at 11:00 a.m. today. There will not be a formal review and comment period, but there will be a 30-day waiting period before the Record of Decision is signed (this is expected to occur August 25, 2000). This 30-day period is not a second public or agency review and comment period. However, any comments received during this 30-day period will be forwarded to CALFED decision makers for their consideration. The agencies are not required to respond formally to those comments.

Mr. Lowrie further explained that much of the contents of the Framework for Action (Framework) are included in the final Programmatic EIS/EIR in some shape or form. However, there may be some aspects that are not defined clearly. For example, the long-term governance structure is not clearly defined in the document because it is still under development and will require legislation.

Regarding funding, Mr. Lowrie explained that the state’s general fund appropriation process is complete. Governor Davis has signed the appropriations bill, which allocates \$20 million for implementation of the Watershed Program. However, the Watershed Program is not authorized to spend these funds at this time. Authorization will come through a trailer bill that is still being drafted. It is speculated that Senator Burton is authoring this trailer bill. Mr. Lowrie added that the Watershed Program staff is working under the assumption that authorization will come through in a timely manner. Therefore, staff is currently developing a Request for Proposals (RFP) process to make funds available for community watershed projects. It is anticipated that the RFP will be released in early October of this year.

Status of BDAC

Eugenia Laychak (CCPDR/CALFED) briefly explained the premise and function of BDAC. BDAC was formed in 1995 to provide advice in the planning process for CALFED. This group of representative stakeholders was formed under the Federal Advisory Committee Act and operates under a federal charter. To date, BDAC has provided advice on the geographic scope, CALFED objectives, solution alternatives, evaluation criteria for CALFED solutions, CALFED governance (both short-term and long-term), and priorities for implementation. In addition, members of BDAC have worked together to develop a recommendation of the CALFED solution. On May 24, 2000, a formal recommendation on the CALFED solution was submitted to the CALFED Policy Group on behalf of BDAC. The recommendation is available for

viewing at the CALFED web site: <http://calfed.ca.gov>.

Ms. Laychak also provided clarification regarding the rumors that BDAC has dissolved. She explained that although BDAC is not planning on meeting again in the near future, the federal charter is valid until July 2001. The Secretary of Interior may dissolve BDAC if he sees fit, although he is not expected to do so. Ms. Laychak was asked what would happen to the Work Group if BDAC dissolves. She explained that officially the Work Group would dissolve as well. However, the federal agencies realize the importance of all the BDAC work groups and it is very doubtful that this would occur. Ms. Laychak stated that it is likely that BDAC and the work groups will stay in place at least until a new form of advisory council is formed under the interim CALFED governance structure. Ms. Davis added that a permanent governance structure must be authorized under legislation. Therefore, it is likely that the interim form of governance will be quite similar to the existing arrangement, which includes the Policy Group, advisory groups, CALFED staff, and agency commitments.

Near Term Tasks

Ms. Davis asked the meeting participants what tasks they felt the Work Group needed to focus on during the next couple of months. Mr. Meacher brought up an issue that he wanted to see the Work Group address in the near term. He explained that the Framework briefly summarizes each of the Common Programs. However, the Watershed Program is the only common element that states that funded activities must “substantially” contribute to CALFED goals. Mr. Meacher explained that his concern is that the Watershed Program is being held to a higher standard than the other common elements. After some discussion, the Work Group agreed to request that all of the Common Programs be held to the same standard. Ms. Davis stated that she would include this issue in the reply letter to Mike Madigan.

The Work Group brainstormed other tasks that should be addressed in the near future. The following are some of the participants’ comments:

- # A discussion needs to be planned to address how the Watershed Program can effectively encourage capacity building among local watershed groups.
- # The Work Group needs to discuss how the Watershed Program can encourage and evaluate multiple benefits.
- # The Work Group should assist in clarifying the proposed RFP criteria to encourage water users, landowners and water rights holders to participate in the program.
- # The Work Group should help define how projects are selected in the RFP process.
- # The Work Group should help develop a strategy for the outreach element of the Watershed Program. Some participants gave support to watershed workshops at the regional or local level. It was also added that the Work Group needs to discuss what is meant by “outreach”.
- # A discussion should be planned to develop strategies that will better integrate environmental justice (rural and urban) and tribal issues into the CALFED process.

- # The Work Group should provide assistance and guidance in preparing a “road map” to achieve the objectives of the Watershed Program Plan.
- # The Work Group should increase communication with BDAC. The Work Group should inform BDAC of the criteria and priorities that have been developed for the RFP package.
- # The Work Group should continue to interact with the other work groups.
- # Watershed assessments should be discussed. If funding watershed assessments is going to be a priority of the Watershed Program, then some type of standard for the assessments should be established.

Future of the Work Group

After a lunch break, Ms. Davis began a discussion on the future of the Work Group. A large part of the discussion was focused on outreach activities. The following are comments from the meeting participants:

- # It is important to include more local watershed “action” people such as landowners and watershed coordinators in the Work Group. These folks need to be engaged in the process. Regional meetings could be an effective tool for outreach to these individuals. Each regional meeting should have a different focus and be specific to the needs of the region.
- # The Work Group has a service to offer beyond what has already been accomplished. The Work Group’s mission in the next phase should focus on implementing the Watershed Program.
- # The Work Group needs to address two important elements, outreach and capacity building. It should assist in defining these elements and proposing ways that the Watershed Program will address and implement them.
- # The Work Group should help develop and compile success stories to illustrate to policy makers how capacity building has led to “on-the-ground” projects.
- # The Work Group should help develop a model for peer learning.
- # One of the future tasks for the Work Group and the Watershed Program should be to address property rights and riparian rights.
- # The Work Group should help to identify ways that the Watershed Program can support capacity building to persuade landowners to “buy in”.

- # The Work Group and Watershed Program should be conscious of its role. The Work Group's tasks do not include organizing landowners at a local level; on the other hand, the Work Group is not in a position to make policy. The Work Group should be very intentional as to where it fits in and how it can truly help implement the Watershed Program Plan.
- # The Work Group should continue to act as a liaison between CALFED and the local watersheds.

Watershed Updates

Department of Conservation - Luree Stetson (Department of Conservation) announced that Governor Davis has approved \$2 million in funding for watershed coordinators. The two-year program will provide funds to Resource Conservation Districts to hire watershed coordinators. The Department of Conservation will conduct workshops beginning in mid to late August to discuss the process. It is anticipated that the applications will be released in November and money allocated early 2001. Contact Ms. Stetson for further details at 916/322-1080.

California Biodiversity Council (CBC) - Nina Gordon (Resources Agency) announced that the next CBC meeting will be held in Rohnert Park on September 20. The "funding paper" that the CBC Watershed Work Group has been working on will be discussed from 10:00 a.m. to noon. Contact Ann Kalsius at 916/227-2661 for additional information.

CBC Watershed Work Group - Ms. Gordon also announced that the next CBC Watershed Work Group meeting will be held on October 6 in Davis.

Meeting Participants

Name	Affiliation
Allyaud, Bill	Sierra Club - California
Barris, Lynn	Sacramento River Watershed Program Resource Center
Burton, Gary	Western Area Power Administration
Carter, Kristin	California State University, Chico
Cornelius, James	Calaveras Water District
Coulter, Ken	State Water Resources Control Board
Crooks, Bill	City of Sacramento
Cutting, Lisa	Mono Lake Committee
Davis, Martha	Inland Empire
Drake, Nettie	Panoche/Silver Creek CRMP
Epting, Rahna	Jones & Stokes
Fox, Dennis	Outdoor Sportsman Coalition
Frankel, Andrew	Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District
Frink, Ted	California Department of Water Resources
Fry, Vicki	Bookman Edmonston
Gonzales, Robert	East Bay Municipal Utility District
Gordon, Nina	California Resources Agency
Harthorn, Allen	Sacramento River Watershed Program
Heiman, Dennis	Regional Water Quality Control Board—Redding
Hoyos, Renee	University of California, Davis -ICE
Knecht, Mary Lee	Jones & Stokes
LaRue, Bruce	Santa Rosa Rancheria
Laychak, Eugenia	California Center for Dispute Resolution/CALFED
Legacki, Laura	University of California, Davis - ICE
Lossius, Bob	Lake County Department of Public Works
Lavalle, Jane	City of San Jose Environmental Services
Lowrie, John	CALFED Watershed Program
Martin, Ajanette	Northern California Water Agencies
Meacher, Robert	Plumas County Supervisor/RCRC/BDAC
Meek, John	San Joaquin Resource Conservation District
Morat, R	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Nakamura, Gary	University of California Cooperative Extension
Newlin, Vicki	Butte County Water Division
Olsen, Jenna	Tuolumne River Preservation Trust
Rentz, Mark	California Forestry Association
Robins, Paul	Yolo County Resource Conservation District
Samson, Pauline	DOI-Office Environmental Policy & Compliance
Smith, Tiffany	Santa Rosa Rancheria
Stetson, Luree	Department of Conservation
Stocker, Val	Yuba County
Tupper, Julie	U.S. Forest Service
Ward, Kevin	University of California, Davis
Wessman, George	HydroGeologic, Inc.
Wills, Leah	Plumas Corporation
Wright, Cary	Sweetwater Authority
Zimny, Chris	California Department of Forestry